



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,931	09/13/2000	ATTAULLAH SHEIKH	36J.P248	7452

5514 7590 03/03/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

mu

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/660,931

Applicant(s)

SHEIKH, ATTAULLAH

Examiner

Thomas Duong

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 19-25 and 29-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 19-25 and 29-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on December 22, 2003 (Paper No. 7). The amendment filed on December 22, 2003 has been entered and made of record. The original application contained *claims 1-31*. In the pre-amendment filed on December 22, 2003, the Applicants canceled *claims 13-18 and 26-28*, added *claims 32-35* and amended *claims 1-3, 7, 9, 12, 19-21, 24 and 29*. There are *no claims* allowed. Hence, *claims 1-12, 19-25 and 29-35* are presented for further consideration and examination.

Response to Argument

2. The Applicants' arguments and amendments filed on December 22, 2003 have been fully considered, but they are not deemed fully persuasive. The Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are deemed moot in view of the following new grounds of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicants' amendments to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.
3. With regard to *claims 1, 12 and 19*, the Applicants point out that:
 - *Amended independent Claim 1 is a method for multicasting changes made in a directory server, comprising the steps of establishing plural multicast groups corresponding to a respective plurality of change*

categories, wherein each multicast group comprises at least one member, and submitting change information for multicasting responsive to a change being made in the directory server, the change information being submitted to the at least one member which belongs to a selected one of the plural multicast groups corresponding to the change category of the change made in the directory server.

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are deemed moot in view of the following new grounds of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicants' amendments to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Crawley (US006321270B1) teaches,

- *establishing plural multicast groups corresponding to a respective plurality of change categories, wherein each multicast group comprises at least one member; and* (Crawley, abstract; col.1, lines 28-52; col.2, lines 18-49; col.3, lines 35-41; col.5, lines 18-35, lines 61-66; fig.1; fig.3)
- *submitting change information for multicasting responsive to a change being made in the directory server, the change information being submitted to the at least one member which belongs to a selected one of the plural multicast groups, corresponding to the change category of the change made in the directory server.* (Crawley, abstract; col.1, lines 28-52; col.2, lines 18-49; col.3, lines 35-41; col.5, lines 18-35, lines 61-66; fig.1; fig.3)

4. With regard to claims 9 and 29, the Applicants point out that:

- *Amended independent Claims 9 is directed to the user side for receiving the change information and more specifically is a method for obtaining directory server change information, comprising the steps of registering as a member of at least one of a plurality of multicast groups, each of the plurality of multicast groups corresponding to a respective plurality of change categories, and receiving a multicast transmission from a directory server, the multicast transmission containing change information submitted to at least one member which belongs to the multicast group corresponding to the change category of a change made in the directory server.*

However, the examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are deemed moot in view of the following new grounds of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by applicant's amendments to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Crawley (US006321270B1) teaches,

- *registering as a member of at least one of a plurality of multicast groups, each of the plurality of multicast groups corresponding to a respective plurality of change categories; and (Crawley, abstract; col.1, lines 28-52; col.2, lines 18-49; col.3, lines 35-41; col.5, lines 18-35, lines 61-66; fig.1; fig.3)*

Art Unit: 2143

- *receiving a multicast transmission from a directory server, the multicast transmission containing change information submitted to at least one member which belongs to the multicast group corresponding to the change category of a change made in the directory server. (Crawley, abstract; col.1, lines 28-52; col.2, lines 18-49; col.3, lines 35-41; col.5, lines 18-35, lines 61-66; fig.1; fig.3)*

5. With regard to claims 32 and 34, the Applicants point out that:

- *Newly-added independent Claim 32 is along the lines of Claim 1 but is more generic by not calling for the change information to be multicast. More specifically, Claim 32 is a method for providing notification of changes made in a directory server, comprising the steps of establishing plural groups corresponding to a respective plurality of change categories that can be made in the directory server, wherein each group comprises at least one member, and sending change information to the at least one member which belongs to a selected one of the plural groups corresponding to the change category of a change made in the directory server.*

However, the examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are deemed not fully persuasive.

Crawley (US006321270B1) teaches,

- *establishing plural groups corresponding to a respective plurality of change categories that can be made in the directory server, wherein each*

group comprises at least one member; and sending change information to the at least one member which belongs to a selected one of the plural groups corresponding to the change category of a change made in the directory server. (Crawley, abstract; col.1, lines 28-52; col.2, lines 18-49; col.3, lines 35-41; col.5, lines 18-35, lines 61-66; fig.1; fig.3)

In summary, the Applicants still failed to clearly disclose the novelty of the invention and identify specific limitation, which would define patentable distinction over prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 9, 12, 19, 29, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Crawley et al. (US006321270B1).
8. With regard to claims 1, 9, 12, 19, 29, 32 and 34, Crawley reference discloses,
- *establishing plural multicast groups corresponding to a respective plurality of change categories, wherein each multicast group comprises at least*

one member; and (Crawley, abstract; col.1, lines 28-52; col.2, lines 18-49; col.3, lines 35-41; col.5, lines 18-35, lines 61-66; fig.1; fig.3)

- *submitting change information for multicasting responsive to a change being made in the directory server, the change information being submitted to the at least one member which belongs to a selected one of the plural multicast groups, corresponding to the change category of the change made in the directory server. (Crawley, abstract; col.1, lines 28-52; col.2, lines 18-49; col.3, lines 35-41; col.5, lines 18-35, lines 61-66; fig.1; fig.3)*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2-8, 10-11, 20-25, 30-31, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawley (US006321270B1) and further in view of Fidler (US006366913B1).

11. With regard to claims 2-6, 10-11, 20-23, 30-31, 33 and 35, Crawley reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 1, 9, 19, 29, 32 and 34* rejection as detailed above.

However, Crawley reference does not teach,

Art Unit: 2143

- *wherein the change information is submitted to the multicast groups utilizing a connectionless protocol.*
- *wherein each of the plurality of change categories correspond to an add, delete, modify or search changes.*
- *wherein changes made in the directory server are performed utilizing a Lightweight Directory Server Protocol.*
- *wherein change information is submitted for multicast by a plug-in that extends capabilities of the directory server.*

Fitler teaches,

- *wherein the change information is submitted to the multicast groups utilizing a connectionless protocol* (Fitler, col.4, lines 16-18; col.5, lines 11-13, lines 31-36; col.6, lines 8-15)
- *wherein each of the plurality of change categories correspond to an add, delete, modify or search changes* (Fitler, col.1, lines 23-63, lines 65-67; col.3, lines 34-35)
- *wherein changes made: in the directory server are performed utilizing a Lightweight Directory Server Protocol* (Fitler, col.4, lines 16-18; col.5, lines 11-13, lines 31-36; col.6, lines 8-15)
- *wherein change information is submitted for multicast by a plug-in that extends capabilities of the directory server* (Fitler, col.1, lines 23-63, lines 65-67; col.3, lines 34-35; col.4, lines 16-18; col.5, lines 11-13, lines 31-36; col.6, lines 8-15; col.7, lines 9-12)

Art Unit: 2143

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fitler reference with Crawley reference to provide a technique for defining groups of users who access network services, or are provided network services, in such a way as to determine membership only when the service is requested or about to be provided, and to determine this membership based on a flexible specification of user or object attributes.

12. With regard to claims 7-8 and 24-25, they include features or limitations as in *claim 1 and 19*. Thus, *claims 7-8 and 24-25* are also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of the *claims 1 and 19*.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:
- McFadden (US006671695B2)
 - Badovinatz et al. (US005793962)
14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 703/305-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703/308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703/872-9306 for regular communications and 703/872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/305-3900.

Thomas Duong (AU2143)

February 27, 2004


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100